

From: Shori, Sunil
Sent: 11/4/2011 2:37:02 PM
To: Campbell, Ben (NRD)
(/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BCC3)
Cc: Doll, Laura (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=LRDD);
Horner, Trina (/O=PG&E/OU=CORPORATE/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TNHC);
Ramaiya, Shilpa R (/o=PG&E/ou=Corporate/cn=Recipients/cn=SRRd); Halligan,
Julie (julie.halligan@cpuc.ca.gov)
Bcc:
Subject: RE: Second Notification for Hydrostatic Testing without Spike Tests

Ben:

For each of the pressure tests where PG&E has indicated it was, or will be, unable to perform spike tests due to elevation and static pressure head conditions, what factors did PG&E consider, and/or which prevented PG&E, from segmenting the tests such that conditions conducive to a minimum 5% spike test could be achieved? For each of the listed pressure tests, what is the minimum number of individual test sections that would be needed in order to facilitate a 5% spike test?

Thanks, Ben.

Sunil Shori

From: Ramaiya, Shilpa R [mailto:SRRd@pge.com]
Sent: Wednesday, November 02, 2011 12:31 PM
To: Cooke, Michelle
Cc: Halligan, Julie; Shori, Sunil; Campbell, Ben (NRD); Horner, Trina; Doll, Laura
Subject: Second Notification for Hydrostatic Testing without Spike Tests

Michelle,

Attached is a letter (and associated spreadsheet) from Ben Campbell of PG&E providing notice for hydrostatic testing where spike testing is inadvisable. There are two new tests to the list, and two that were removed given the scheduled insertion of new pipe.

Thanks.

Shilpa Ramaiya

415-973-3186